

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application and stand rejected. No claims have been amended in this paper; the listing of claims is provided solely for the convenience of the Examiner.

Rejection of Claims 1-2 and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Schneiderman In View of Kreller et al.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a method for a mobile agent object to dynamically extend its capabilities including configuring the mobile agent object to install a service object executable in a mobile-agent runtime environment. The mobile agent object is operable to execute in a first electronic device, halt execution in the first electronic device at an execution state, be transplanted to a second electronic device, and resume execution from the execution state in the second electronic device.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Schneiderman fails to teach or suggest configuring a mobile agent to install a service object to be executable in a mobile-agent runtime environment. However, contrary to the Examiner's stated position, Kreller et al. likewise fails to teach or suggest configuring a mobile agent to install a service object to be executable in a mobile-agent runtime environment.

In the most recent final Office Action, at page 9, the Examiner states the following in maintaining the rejection based on the Kreller reference:

“Kreller teaches configuring the mobile to install a service object to be executable (The agent system, which can be installed on computers connected in a computer network, has an agent platform and an agent system controller. The agent platform comprises service programs required by a mobile agent in order to be able to be executed on the respective computer, col 3, ln 11-17)/ the agent system launcher to be installed [configured] on other computers onto which such an agent system is intended to be loaded, said agent system launcher then requesting, loading[loading] and starting an agent system adjusted to its



environment, col 4, ln 10-14/ the agent system launcher is designed[configured] both for loading a full agent system and for loading parts of the agent system, col 9, ln 43-45/ To manage the agent systems on a plurality of mobile client computers 28, col 7, ln 62-65/ an agent system launcher loaded onto the client computer[mobile], col 9, ln 25-26).”

It is noted that, other than the cited passage at col. 3, lines 11-17, the Examiner has not previously cited these passages of Kreller as allegedly teaching configuring a mobile agent to install a service object. The Applicant’s attorney respectfully submits that neither the above-quoted passage nor the passages of Kreller cited therein teach or suggest configuring a mobile agent to install a service object. Additionally, the Applicant’s attorney respectfully submits that the Examiner is unclear as to which parts of the Kreller system he regards as a “mobile agent object” and a “service object.” For example, does the Examiner regard the “client computer [mobile],” the “agent system launcher,” or some other component to be a mobile agent object?

As stated by Applicant’s attorney in the most recent previously submitted paper, if the Examiner disagrees with these positions, and to better enable a fair chance for the Applicant to respond, the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out in the Kreller reference the specific activity considered to be configuring the mobile agent to install a service object, and the specific reference to installation of the service object. Moreover, because the Examiner did not previously cite most of the passages of Kreller cited in the above-quoted discussion, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the finality of the instant Action to afford a meaningful prosecutorial dialogue on whether such passages indeed teach what the Examiner alleges. Alternatively, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Claims 2 and 13

Claims 2 and 13 are patentable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1.

**Rejection of Claims 3-11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over
Schneiderman In View of Kreller and Yokoyama**

Claims 3-6

As stated by Applicant's attorney in a previously submitted paper, Yokoyama fails in any manner to supply the teachings missing from Schneiderman and Kreller, namely a mobile object capable of installing service objects, or for that matter, anything, executable in a mobile-agent runtime environment. In fact, and as also stated by Applicant's attorney in a previous paper, a thorough reading of Yokoyama reveals that the Yokoyama reference fails to even so much as use the terms "install," "installation" or the like. As such, Schneiderman, Kreller and Yokoyama, taken either each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 2. Consequently, claims 3-6 are patentable for at least the reason of their dependency from claim 2.

Claim 7

Claim 7 is patentable for reasons at least similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 2.

Claims 8-11

Claims 8-11 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from claim 7.

**Rejection of Claim 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over
Schneiderman In View of Kreller and Further In View of Wang**

Wang fails to supply the teachings missing from Schneiderman and Kreller, namely a data structure comprising a first instruction set that when executed by a computing device causes the data structure to navigate from a first host computing environment to a second host computing environment having a mobile-agent runtime environment, and a second instruction set that when executed by a computing device causes the installation of a service object executable in the mobile-agent runtime environment and that may be called by any process or subsequent

mobile-agent object that is executing in the mobile-agent runtime environment. As such Schneiderman, Kreller and Wang, taken each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 7. Accordingly, claim 12 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 7.

Rejection of Claim 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over
Schneiderman In View of Kreller and Saulpaugh

Saulpaugh fails in any manner to supply the teachings missing from Schneiderman and Kreller, namely a mobile object capable of installing service objects executable in a mobile-agent runtime environment. As such, Schneiderman, Kreller and Saulpaugh, taken either each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 2. Consequently, claim 14 is patentable for at least the reason of its dependency from claim 2.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant requests a finding of allowability for all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. **If the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant's position that all pending claims are allowable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to arrange a telephonic discussion of the application prior to issuing an Office Action rejecting any of the claims based on the cited references.**

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}

/P.G. Scott Born/

P.G. Scott Born
Registration No. 40,523
Direct Dial: 206.957.2491